## **EXHIBIT 14**

		Page 1
1	CONFIDENTIAL - MATTHEW GREENBLATT	
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW	
4		-x
_	In re:	SIPA LIQUIDATION
5		
6	BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT	No. 08-01789(BRL)
7	SECURITIES LLC,	/ Gloot
7		(Substantively Consolidated)
8	Debtor.	Consolidated)
_	DCDC01.	-x
9	IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee of the	
	Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff	
10	Investment Securities LLC,	
11	Plaintiff,	
		Adv. Pro. No.
12	vs.	09-01182(BRL)
13	J. EZRA MERKIN, GABRIEL	
	CAPITAL, L.P., ARIEL FUND LTD.,	
14	ASCOT PARTNERS, L.P., GABRIEL	
1 -	CAPITAL CORPORATION,	
15	D - f 1	
16	Defendants.	v
17	***CONFIDENTIAL***	A
18	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MATTHEW	GREENBLATT
19	New York, New York	
20	August 17, 2015	
21		
22		
23	Reported by:	
24	KATHY S. KLEPFER, RMR, RPR, CRR,	CLR
25	JOB NO. 96625	

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- the IRS were necessitated by fictitious activity
- 3 in the accounts?
- 4 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^5$  A. I would say yes.
- Q. And those tax payments were not made
- <sup>7</sup> at the request of account holders, correct?
- 8 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- <sup>9</sup> A. I don't know whether or not they ever
- said, "Pay them on my behalf or not." The
- calculation, though, goes to the books and
- 12 records and a reconstruction of the items on the
- books and records as to what transactions
- 14 actually transpired with respect to cash and
- principal. So those payments were made on
- behalf of account holders by BLMIS and,
- therefore, have been concluded were reductions
- of their principal.
- Q. And you're not offering an opinion as
- to the appropriateness of deductions of the tax
- payments from the net equity; that was
- determined by counsel, right?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. As I said before, the net equity
- determinations are essentially a legal

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- conclusion, and from the very beginning, I was
- 3 asked by counsel to the trustee to identify cash
- 4 and principal transactions and to apply this
- methodology of inflows and outflows.
- Q. You're not offering an opinion as to
- <sup>7</sup> the appropriateness of that methodology,
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- Q. Was there any other analysis that you
- 11 had done that was altered before -- before
- issuing your final reports?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. I don't think -- I can't think of any,
- 15 no.
- Q. Are you being compensated for your
- time spent on the Merkin and Madoff cases?
- <sup>18</sup> A. Yes.
- 19 Q. How are you being compensated?
- A. Me, personally, or my firm?
- Q. How are you personally being
- compensated?
- $^{23}$  A. I draw a salary and bonus over time.
- Q. How is the amount of your bonus
- <sup>25</sup> determined?

- BRUCE G. DUBINSKY
- the fraud; it's going in and objectively
- looking at the facts and circumstances of a
- 4 situation and then determining whether or not
- fraud existed; or if there's evidence to show
- that it's not fraud, to conclude that there
- 7 wasn't fraud.
- 8 Q. And -- and in every instance it
- 9 starts with the premise that you have to
- believe that there's a fraud; is that right?
- 11 A. Yes. And I think that from the
- standpoint it makes sense because if there's
- not evidence or -- or some sort of allegation
- of fraud inquiry, why would I be doing an
- $^{15}$  investigation. I think the ACFE, when they
- put that in their ethics, wanted to make sure
- its members weren't on just a fishing
- expedition, but were doing work that was
- 19 focused on there was some allegation of fraud.
- Q. So you don't, for example, pull
- some random sampling of situations and say,
- let me see whether there's fraud in any of
- them or what percentage of cases there's
- fraud, you start from there's some allegation
- of fraud and see if you can prove it?

- BRUCE G. DUBINSKY
- MS. KOSACK: Object to form.
- A. Yeah, I didn't understand your
- question. It sounded like you were talking
- 5 about sampling or some sort of research.
- Q. Sure. I take it you never start
- <sup>7</sup> from the kind of neutral hypothesis of I'm
- going to take ten companies or ten investment
- <sup>9</sup> advisers and investigate whether there's any
- fraud at any of them; you start -- you always
- start from the premise of I believe that
- there's fraud at this particular one, let me
- see what I can prove?
- A. As to me, I've never been hired in
- the -- the former example you gave; I've
- always been hired when a client believes there
- was some problem and then I'm hired.
- Q. And I take it it is your belief
- that most fraud is uncovered as a result of
- some confession or some whistleblower and
- not -- well, strike.
- That -- that most fraud is
- uncovered as a result of either a confession
- by the perpetrator or some whistleblower; is
- that right?

1 CONFIDENTIAL - MATTHEW GREENBLATT

- We have identified all of those line
- items where funds were attempted to be
- $^4$  transferred from one to the other, and then we
- 5 look at how much principal was available in the
- 6 account at the time of that transfer and move
- over only those funds up to the balance of
- 8 principal available in the transferor's account
- 9 at the time.
- 10 Q. What about the transfer of securities
- between BLMIS accounts, did you factor that into
- the principal balance calculation?
- 13 A. Those have all been reviewed and
- considered, but as the fictitious trading has
- been identified within Madoff, the securities
- were not actually purchased, no securities
- actually existed, so the securities could not be
- moved from one account to another because they
- didn't exist. So those have all been considered
- and excluded from the calculation.
- 21 O. And did you make the determination to
- 22 exclude the transfer of securities between BLMIS
- <sup>23</sup> accounts?
- $^{24}$  A. It was not my decision to be made. It
- was part of the methodology that the trustee and

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- his team had determined was the appropriate
- method with which to calculate the net equity
- 4 balances.
- 5 So I identified all of those instances
- of inter-account transfers of funds and
- <sup>7</sup> identified principal available in everybody's
- 8 account, and I identified all the instances of
- 9 transfers of reportedly held but fictitious
- securities; and the decision was made that the
- 11 fictitious trading activity and the fictitious
- securities, any fictitious gains generated, all
- of the fictitious activity couldn't be moved
- from one account to another, and only funds in
- the form of principal could be moved in the
- inter-account transfers.
- 0. And you're not offering any opinion as
- to the appropriateness of excluding the transfer
- of securities between BLMIS accounts, correct?
- A. It calls for a legal conclusion, so
- all I'm offering is the calculation of the
- methodology that accounts only for principal.
- Q. Did you ever discuss factoring in the
- transfer of securities between BLMIS accounts
- into your principal balance calculation?

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 A. I performed the calculation where it
- was determined that the appropriate method to
- 4 calculate net equity or determine net equity was
- 5 to account for all actual cash and principal
- transactions on the face of the BLMIS documents
- on the books and records that we were
- 8 reconstructing in an effort to calculate the
- 9 reality of the Madoff situation and to disallow
- any of the fictitious trading activity.
- 11 Q. You're the expert who signed these
- 12 reports, correct?
- $^{13}$  A. Yes.
- Q. And as the expert, you made the
- determination to exclude those transactions from
- the principal balance calculation, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form. Asked
- and answered.
- A. I don't agree with that, no.
- Q. Where in your report do you say that
- you're excluding the transfer of securities
- between BLMIS accounts from your principal
- 23 balance calculation?
- A. It's captured in paragraph 18, where
- 25 it says, "The principal balance calculation does

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- not include trading activity reflected on
- 3 customer statements. At the direction of
- 4 Trustee's counsel, no credit is given or removed
- 5 for gains or losses resulting from trades
- 6 reflected on customer statements."
- 7 Q. Is the transfer of securities from one
- 8 BLMIS account to another a trade?
- 9 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 10 A. No, I wouldn't call it a trade.
- 11 Q. So where in your report do you say
- that you're excluding the transfers of
- securities between BLMIS accounts from your
- principal balance calculation?
- 15 A. It's implied in that sentence. It
- doesn't use the words, but the principal balance
- calculation doesn't include the trading
- 18 activity. The direction I was provided was to
- prepare a calculation based on the inflows and
- the outflows that are in paragraph 17 and to not
- give any credit to any of the fictitiously
- 22 purchased securities or any of the fictitious
- 23 gains from fictitious sales of securities or any
- of that related trading activity.
- So, in situations where securities

1 CONFIDENTIAL - MATTHEW GREENBLATT

- that don't exist are attempted to be moved from
- 3 Account A to Account B, the principal that
- 4 exists in an account is not ignored; it's left
- 5 in the transfer -- the principal is left in the
- transferor's account because the securities
- <sup>7</sup> can't be moved.
- 8 Q. Paragraph 17 says you considered
- 9 non-cash deposits, correct?
- 10 A. It says that, yes.
- 11 Q. Is a security that's being transferred
- from one BLMIS to another a non-cash deposit of
- 13 principal?
- 14 A. In certain cases, yes. There are
- instances where BLMIS customers deposited real
- bonds or real securities from other brokerage
- accounts, and those were granted as principal to
- those account holders because they represented
- real non-cash deposits.
- The fictitiously reported purchases of
- securities are treated differently because the
- fictitious trading never took place, so the
- securities listed on the vast majority of
- 24 customer statements that were falsely reported
- as purchased, those securities never existed,

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 BLMIS never had custody of those shares, and
- therefore, those shares couldn't be moved from
- <sup>4</sup> Account A to Account B.
- <sup>5</sup> Q. When cash was transferred from one
- 6 BLMIS account to another, was there actual cash
- <sup>7</sup> being transferred?
- A. And I never used the word "cash" being
- 9 transferred because, no, cash was not
- transferred in inter-account transfers. It was
- a book entry, where liquid --
- 12 liquidly-available-looking funds were moved, but
- 13 no cash ever changed hands.
- 14 Q. So it was just a book entry that you
- included in your principal balance calculation?
- A. For the inter-account transfers?
- 17 Ouestion mark.
- 18 Q. Yes, for the inter-account transfers,
- it was just a book entry that you included in
- your principal balance calculation, correct?
- 21 A. Those inter-account transfers that are
- reflected in the principal balance calculation
- are book entries made to move funds from one
- account to another, and then the analysis that I
- described earlier was put on each one of those.

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- O. And did the cash reflected in those
- 3 book entries actually exist?
- 4 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^5$  A. They weren't cash transactions.
- Q. What do you mean by that?
- A. No cash changed hands. If he
- 8 transferred funds from Account A to Account B,
- there was never any cash that changed hands.
- Only movements in a customer's account related
- to those funds, and for that we looked to see
- whether or not actual principal existed, not
- 13 cash.
- 0. And when securities were traded
- between BLMIS accounts, those were just book
- entries too, right?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 18 A. I don't understand what you mean by
- "when securities were traded between accounts."
- Q. I apologize.
- 21 When the customer statements showed
- securities being transferred from one BLMIS
- account to another, do you know whether there
- were -- those securities actually existed?
- $^{25}$  A. Well, I'll first say that, in most of

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- those transactions, they didn't show that they
- were being transferred. The customer statements
- 4 usually reflected delivery on one end and
- <sup>5</sup> receipt on the other end, and those securities
- 6 did not exist. So delivery could not have
- <sup>7</sup> happened and, therefore, receipt could not have
- 8 happened.
- 9 Q. Just like the cash transferred between
- 10 BLMIS accounts didn't actually exist, correct?
- 11 A. But it's not reported as cash.
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- Q. So the book entries are just a symbol
- of the cash -- of cash being transferred from
- one BLMIS account to another, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 17 A. I don't use the word "cash" in that
- description in any way. It's -- it's value or
- 19 funds available in an account, but no cash ever
- changes hands on these inter-account transfers.
- Q. Did the transferor of securities from
- one BLMIS account to another believe that they
- 23 have transfer value?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. I don't know in those situations the

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 calcu- -- my report and the calculation that I
- 3 prepared doesn't factor in what the account
- 4 holders knew or should have known.
- <sup>5</sup> Q. If the owner of one BLMIS account had
- transferred all of the securities in that
- account to another BLMIS account, could the
- 8 owner then have withdrawn anything from that
- 9 account, assuming there was no cash in the
- 10 account?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 12 A. Yeah, I'm going to need you to do that
- again. When you say the "owner," are you still
- referring to the transferor?
- <sup>15</sup> Q. Yes.
- A. So could you repeat that? So if the
- 17 transferor?
- 18 Q. Let's say someone owns a BLMIS
- account, it has some securities and no cash, and
- that person transfers all of the securities to
- 21 another BLMIS account. After that transfer
- occurs, can that person then withdraw value from
- his or her BLMIS account?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. It's a more complicated question

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 the transferor of those securities now claim
- $^{3}$  that he or she has a principal balance in that
- 4 account?
- 5 A. In that same situation, we have to --
- there's multiple factors. Did they have valid
- <sup>7</sup> principal in the account? Because the
- 8 securities held is not directly --
- 9 O. Assume they had -- sorry.
- 10 A. -- reconcilable to the principal
- 11 available in an account, so we need a few more
- variables filled in.
- 13 Q. Assuming they had principal balance
- equivalent to the securities transferred outside
- of the account, can that transferor then claim a
- principal balance?
- 17 A. The transferor, in that situation,
- yes, because the principal stays with the
- transferor's account. If a fictitious security
- is moved from A to B, and that security never
- existed, can't be delivered and can't be
- received by the transferee, the principal
- remains in the transferor's account and can be
- <sup>24</sup> drawn down.
- Q. And it's your expert opinion that

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- <sup>2</sup> Account A to Account B.
- Q. And you think even though the result
- of that is that someone who believes they have
- 5 transferred all of the securities out of their
- 6 account then has a principal balance left in the
- <sup>7</sup> account?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 9 A. If I understood the question correct,
- 10 I would say yes, because the transferor
- shouldn't be punished by a transfer that didn't
- exist and couldn't have taken place. So the
- principal still exists within the four walls of
- the BLMIS estate, but it still belongs to the
- 15 transferor.
- Q. But what about the transferee; is it
- appropriate that, although the transferor
- intended to transfer everything in their account
- to the transferee, the transferee then has no
- 20 principal balance as a result?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. The calculation itself doesn't factor
- in any account holder's intent in any
- $^{24}$  transaction. So I don't think that that is any
- 25 different than those situations where funds are

BRUCE G. DUBINSKY

- representing to me on the record and for
- $^3$  purposes of your questions, I'll assume it is,
- but I don't know.
- <sup>5</sup> Q. And do you have appendices in your
- binders that are in front of you somewhere?
- A. I don't think the appendices -- let
- $^8$  me see. Let me check one other place. No,
- <sup>9</sup> these don't have the appendix. They would
- have been attached as part of the report.
- 11 Q. Well, I will represent to you that
- this, to the best of my knowledge, is
- Exhibit B that was from the report produced by
- the -- or sent to us by the trustee, but
- attached to your report that's Exhibit 1.
- <sup>16</sup> A. Okay.
- Q. And is this -- you said that you
- had provided a detailed list of the documents
- 19 that you considered. Assuming this is in fact
- the Exhibit B that was attached to the report
- in this case, would this be that list?
- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And it has a long list. For
- example, it starts with some articles and
- books, and it goes to a list of pleadings; is

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- L.P. were each net losers as of December 2008,
- 3 correct?
- A. And I want to say "yes" to that, but
- 5 the term "net loser" I guess is a term of art in
- that situation. So when you say "net loser,"
- 7 what do you mean?
- 8 Q. What do you think I mean?
- <sup>9</sup> A. I think you mean that they had
- deposited more than they had withdrawn when the
- 11 Ponzi scheme came to an end.
- 12 O. And do you agree that Ascot Partners,
- 13 Ariel Fund Limited, Gabriel Capital, L.P. had
- all deposited more than they had withdrawn?
- 15 A. I'm just going to confirm that answer,
- but "yes" is my answer. When you say Ariel
- Fund, Ariel -- did you say Ariel Fund or Ariel
- 18 Capital?
- Q. Ariel Fund Limited.
- <sup>20</sup> A. Yes.
- Q. And turning to Exhibit 3D in your
- March 20 report.
- $^{23}$  A. Yes.
- 0. You found that Ascot Partners had over
- <sup>25</sup> \$226 million of principal left in its account in

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- December 11, 2008, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And turning to Exhibit 3E, you
- 5 determined that Ariel Fund had more than \$175
- 6 million of principal left in its account on
- December 11, 2008, correct?
- 8 A. The -- and there were several Ariel
- <sup>9</sup> funds, some of which ended previously with zero
- balances, but Ariel Fund Account 1FR070, yes.
- Q. And turning to Exhibit 3F, you
- determined that Gabriel Capital, L.P. had more
- than \$163 million of principal left in its
- account on December 11, 2008, correct?
- <sup>15</sup> A. Correct.
- Q. And so, as you defined it, all three
- of these accounts were net losers, correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
- Q. And turning to paragraph 96 of your
- report, your March 20 report, you also
- determined that of the more than \$974 million in
- total principal invested in Ascot Partners'
- account, only about \$490 million was ever
- withdrawn, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- Q. But you only credited just over \$221
- million to the Ascot Partners' account principal
- 4 balance because that was the available principal
- balance that you had calculated to be in Ascot
- Fund's account as of January 8, 2003, correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit 40 of
- <sup>9</sup> your March 20 report.
- 10 A. Okay.
- 11 Q. And do you see that on the last page
- of that exhibit, there is the other side of that
- transaction, where Ascot Partners is
- 14 transferring funds -- I mean where Ascot Fund is
- transferring funds to Ascot Partners, correct?
- A. I see it, yes.
- Q. And columns 7 and 8 show the total
- principal balance that you had calculated Ascot
- Fund to have on January 8, 2003, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. Yes, column 8 shows the principal
- 22 available. Column 7 shows the principal then
- that was transferred to the transferee.
- Q. Okay. And one of the transfers that
- you factored into that total of \$221 million in

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- <sup>2</sup> principal available in January of 2003 appears
- on page 2 of Exhibit 40 at the top; it's a
- 4 transfer from account number 1FN0430 dated
- January 4, 1993, correct?
- A. It was -- I think you missed one zero.
- <sup>7</sup> 1FN00430, yes.
- Q. Okay. And was this a transfer from
- 9 Ariel Fund to Ascot Fund?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And this transfer, according to the
- customer statements, was in the amount of \$35
- million, correct?
- 14 A. And change, yes.
- Q. And but you only credited about \$13.6
- million to Ascot Fund's principal balance,
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. And you only attributed that amount
- because you had calculated that, as of January
- $^{21}$  4, 1993, Ariel Fund only had \$13 --
- 22 approximately \$13.6 million in principal balance
- on that date, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Let's turn to Exhibit 4A of

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- your March 20 report, and on page 3, toward the
- bottom, is that transfer from Ariel Fund of
- 4 about \$35 million to Ascot Fund on January 4,
- <sup>5</sup> 1993, correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And then in column 8 is your
- 8 calculation of the principal balance available
- 9 in Ariel Fund in January of 1993, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Please turn to page 2 of Exhibit A,
- 4A, of your March 20 report.
- 13 A. Okay.
- 14 Q. You credit a number of inter-account
- transfers to Ariel Fund in calculating its
- principal balance, correct?
- A. A number of transfers into?
- Q. You calculate -- yes. In
- 19 calculating -- in calculating the principal
- $^{20}$  balance available in Ariel Fund in January 1993,
- there are two transfers of principal credited to
- 22 Ariel Fund, correct?
- A. There are two transfers of principal
- in, yes.
- Q. One of these transfers is a March 31,

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 1992 transfer from BLMIS Account 1FN033?
- A. Correct, which you will see from that
- 4 line item at the time had the Account Number
- $5 \quad 105121 3 0$
- 0. And that's a Shalvah account, correct?
- <sup>7</sup> A. That is correct.
- Q. And did you credit any other transfers
- 9 from Shalvah Fund to Ariel Fund --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- in calculating the principal
- 12 balance?
- $^{13}$  A. Yes.
- 0. Okay. Where is that?
- 15 A. The last line item, on May 29, 1992,
- the last line item on page 2.
- 0. Were there any other transfers from
- 18 Shalvah to Ariel Fund included in your principal
- balance calculation to Ariel Fund?
- A. Those were the only two transfers of
- $^{21}$  funds from Shalvah to Ariel Fund. There was, as
- we've been talking about for a while, there was
- <sup>23</sup> a transfer or a delivery of fictitiously
- reported securities from Shalvah to Ariel, but
- the securities didn't exist and, therefore,

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 aren't included on this calculation.
- O. Did the funds exist?
- 4 A. The column 8 will tell you how much
- 5 principal was available in the account at the
- time of each of those transfers. So, yes, there
- 7 were -- they were in a positive principal
- balance at the time, but, as we discussed
- 9 earlier, because the fictitious securities
- didn't exist, they couldn't be delivered.
- 11 Q. And you understand that Shalvah's
- account was closed in about 1992, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 14 A. I know that the account activity
- ceased, and I'm not sure whether or not it was
- closed officially within Madoff's system or not,
- but I know the account activity ceased and that
- 18 this was the account holder's final -- final set
- of transactions within that account.
- Q. And as BLMIS operated, there was
- 21 nothing left in the account as of 1992, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^{23}$  A. I believe that's the case, yes. I'm
- not sure when in 1992. I believe in October or
- November of 1992, yes.

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- Q. But you calculated that Shalvah had a
- $^{3}$  principal balance of 9. -- about \$9.7 million in
- 4 October of 1992, correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. And based on your calculations, you
- yould credit a principal balance of \$9.7 million
- 8 to Shalvah as of December 11, 2008, correct?
- 9 A. Correct, that's their principal
- balance from October of 1992 continuing through
- 11 to December 11 of 2008.
- 12 O. And that's because you didn't reduce
- that balance based on the securities transferred
- out of the Shalvah account, correct?
- 15 A. Because the fictitious securities
- didn't exist, correct.
- 0. And you did not give Ariel Fund credit
- for the transfer of those securities, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- MS. BRONEN: Let's take a five-minute
- $^{21}$  break.
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
- the record. The time is 1:19 p.m.
- 24 (Recess.)
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:33